

From: [david morrison](#)
To: [DOH EPH RP Info](#)
Subject: WiFi Study Comment
Date: Monday, February 17, 2014 3:28:43 PM

To Whom It May Concern:

It is sad to see that the study on the safety of wi fi in schools that is being orchestrated by the State of Washington appears to have been a set up to show that there is no harm from this technology. With the limited criteria that was used in choosing the various venues to vet the "science" there was no chance of finding an institution that was not influenced by industry money. All of the major health agencies around the world, including the W.H.O. have telecommunications CEO's sitting on their board of directors. A multi trillion dollar industry is not going to let these investigations get in their way or produce any bad press.

The American Cancer Society and the NCI are among the most corrupt institutions. All one has to do is to investigate the source of their donations and how much comes from industry and the story becomes clear. www.bloomingtonalternative.com/articles/2012/03/17/10926

The question is, does the state of Washington really have an interest in protecting our children or in lining their pockets with industry and government kickbacks and aligning themselves with the most corrupt industry in the world against our children? That is really what it boils down to however you can rationalize this however you want. I am sure that the comments that are coming to you will validate the American Association of Environmental Physicians statement that the proof of harm is "**irrefutable.**" YOU DO WITH THAT WHAT YOU WILL. IT IS UNCONSCIONABLE, AMORAL, CORRUPT at this point to claim that there is no harm.

The following is a story of how this industry operates by buying propagandist journalism. This industry tainted article came out in the newspaper, The Economist, a couple of years ago and the result was a huge outcry from the scientific community regarding the accuracy of the article. It was clear that the article was bogus and propagandist and was written to defray the amount of bad press that cell phones and other wireless exposures are getting. Fortunately there are legitimate news venues, mostly outside of the U.S., that do report about the devastating effects of microwave radiation.

The same thing will happen with the Washington Study if it fails to take an "objective" look at the amount of science that has accrued over the years, and the statements from Medical Agencies, Governments, Government Agencies, etc. There will be a world wide outcry that will destroy the credibility of the Washington State Dept. of Health and for that -- future liability for damages to the health of thousands or even millions of children will lie in the hands of the State of Washington.

David Morrison

Personal Information - Private

Vancouver WA 98661

Personal Information - Private

[**MEDIA ADVISORY – Scientists, Physicians and Oncologists from Several Nations Criticize The Economist's Inaccurate Coverage of Cell Phone and Wireless Risks, Calling for Retraction**](#)

28.12.2011 by emily Category [Electromagnetic Health Blog](#)

New York, NY, December 28, 2011. Experts in public health, oncology, neurosurgery, electronic engineering, toxicology, cardiology and epidemiology from the United Kingdom, USA, Finland, Sweden, Australia, Austria and the Slovak Republic have published a critique today of an opinion piece published in *The Economist* (9/3/11), ["Worrying about Wireless"](#).*

In the critique, entitled ["The Economist—and the Truth About Microwave Radiation Emitted from Wireless Technologies"](#), the experts say the *Economist* failed to provide critical information about the emerging public health issue related to cell phones and wireless technologies and that it owes its readers a better accounting of the science.

Ronald B. Herberman, MD, Founding Director Emeritus of the University of Pittsburgh Cancer Institute, Chairman of Environmental Health Trust and a distinguished cancer researcher, says of the *Economist* article, "The public the world over has been misled by this reporting."

Dr. Herberman, who served as Professor of Medicine and Pathology at the University of Pittsburgh Cancer Institute, Hillman Professor of Oncology and Vice Chancellor for Cancer Research at the University of Pittsburgh, and who is now Chief Medical Officer of Intrexon Corporation, in 2008 issued an advisory to his faculty and staff recommending a variety of simple steps to reduce potential health risks from the use of cell phones. He says:

"A disservice has been done in inaccurately depicting the body of science, which actually indicates that there are biological effects from the radiation emitted by wireless devices, including damage to DNA, and evidence for increased risk of cancer and other substantial health consequences." Dr. Herberman adds, "It would behoove *The Economist* to publicly correct the errors made in this unsigned opinion piece by publishing a retraction—and investigating how such inaccurate and unbalanced scientific reporting could have occurred in the first place."

Lennart Hardell, MD, PhD, Professor of Oncology, Orebro Medical Center, Orebro, Sweden, and a widely published, internationally renowned neuro-oncologist, agrees. He says, "*The Economist* has misrepresented the science indicating biological effects, links to cancers, and damage to DNA and male fertility from exposures to microwave radiation emitted by wireless technologies. Given the wide scale use of cell phones and other wireless devices globally, for the sake of public health I consider it essential that *The Economist's* reporting be corrected to adequately advise readers of the risks."

Dr. Hardell's research has repeatedly found increased risk of brain cancers in frequent users of cell phones and/or cordless phones for more than a decade. His team's research was cited in May in the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) landmark decision to classify wireless radiation as a Class 2B 'Possible Carcinogen'.

Policy advocate Deborah Kopald, MBA states, "It is exceedingly difficult to convince policy-makers to act in the public interest and parents and educators to give their charges proper guidance when they can point to a prestigious publication that provides false reassurance that not enough science exists to compel immediate behavior changes with wireless use."

Swedish investigative journalist Mona Nilsson, says, "The publication of *The Economist* article ['Worrying about Wireless'](#) was a sad day in journalism. If we cannot trust the media to accurately report the science on such an important subject in a balanced way, then who can we trust?" Nilsson was the journalist who broke the news that led to the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) removing Anders

Ahlbom of the Karolinska Institute last May from chairing its panel of experts after learning Ahlbom had not disclosed he was a member of the board of his brother's consulting firm, Gunnar Ahlbom AB, with links to the telecom industry.

Authors of the Economist critique, issued today, "[The Economist—and the Truth About Microwave Radiation Emitted from Wireless Technologies](#)", include prominent scientists, physicians and oncologists from ten countries. They are requesting the *Economist* to correct its unsigned opinion piece so that it more accurately reflects the range of known biological effects and potential health risks from wireless radiation.

Primary Media Contact:

Ronald Herberman, MD (USA) – Personal Information - ...

Founding Director Emeritus, University of Pittsburgh Cancer Institute
Chief Medical Officer, Intrexon Corporation
Chairman, Environmental Health Trust
rherberman[at]jintrexon.com

Mikko Ahonen, PhD (public health), Finland – mikko.ahonen[at]juta.fi
Igor Belyaev, PhD (radiobiology), Slovak Republic – Igor.Belyaev[at]gmt.su.se
Martin Blank, PhD (physiology/cellular biophysics), USA – mb32[at]columbia.edu
Michael Carlberg, MSc (statistics), Sweden – michaelrita[at]yahoo.se
Devra Davis, PhD, MPH (epidemiology/toxicology), USA – ddavis[at]ehtrust.org
Alvaro Almeida Augusto de Salles, PhD (electrical engineering), Brazil – aasalles[at]ufrgs.br
Vicky Fobel (cellphone safety), UK – vicky.fobel[at]mobilewise.org
Adamantia F. Fragopoulou, MSc, PhD (radiation biology), Greece- madofrag[at]biol.uoa.gr
Örjan Hallberg, MSc (electrical engineering), Sweden – oerjan.hallberg[at]swipnet.se
Lennart Hardell, MD, PhD (neuro-oncology), Sweden – lennart_hardell[at]hotmail.com
Magda Havas, PhD (environmental & resource studies), Canada – drmagdahavas[at]gmail.com
Olle Johansson, PhD (neuroscience), Sweden – olle.johansson[at]jki.se
Deborah Kopald, MBA (public health advocacy & policy), USA – Deborah_Kopald[at]ymail.com
Sianette Kwee, PhD (biochemistry), Denmark – sianettekwee[at]yahoo.com
Donald Maisch, PhD (electromagnetic standards), Australia – dmaisch[at]emfacts.com
Lukas H. Margaritis, PhD (cell biology), Greece- lmargar[at]biol.uoa.gr
L. Lloyd Morgan, BSEE (electronic engineering), USA – Lloyd.L.Morgan[at]gmail.com
Wilhelm Mosgöller, MD (toxicology), Austria – wm[at]scigenia.com
Mona Nilsson (investigative journalism), Sweden – mona[at]monanilsson.se
Eileen O'Connor (public health advocacy & policy), UK – info[at]radiationresearch.org
Alasdair Philips, B.Sc. (Eng), DAgE (electrical engineering), UK – alasdair[at]powerwatch.org.uk
Camilla R. G. Rees, MBA (public health education & advocacy), USA – crgr[at]aol.com
Professor M. S. Al Salameh, PhD (electrical engineering- EMI/EMC), Jordan – salameh[at]just.edu.jo
Stephen Sinatra, MD (cardiology), USA – sts Sinatra[at]msn.com
Fredrik Söderqvist, DMedSc (epidemiology), Sweden – fredrik_soderqvist[at]yahoo.se
Brian Stein, CEO (public health advocacy & policy) – Brian.Stein[at]SamworthBrothers.co.uk
Alex Swinkels (public health advocacy & policy), Netherlands – alex[at]international-emf-alliance.org
Charles Teo, MD (neurosurgery), Australia – charlie[at]neuroendoscopy.info
Stelios A Zinelis, MD (Hellenic Cancer Society, Cefallonia), Greece – zinelis[at]otenet.gr

From: [david.morrison](#)
To: [DOH EPH RP Info](#)
Subject: Responding to Wi-Fi Safety Concerns in Our Schools
Date: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 7:52:36 PM

Feb. 26, 2014

To Whom it May Concern:

After reading your report it is shocking to me that the results of your review could conclude that "Wi Fi is safe". Reading the quotes below, taken from your report, it looks like you are taking a huge risk for future liability law suits on such flimsy and consistent statements of inconsistency:

"there is **no clear and consistent** evidence"

"no **good** evidence"

"there is **still uncertainty**"

"there is **Limited Evidence**"

"there is no **convincing** evidence."

"**limited evidence**"

"Some measurable biological/ physiological effects **cannot be ruled out.**"

"This **uncertainty** (regarding mobile phone use) is **considered to be low.**"

"**negligible uncertainty**"

"but **more research is needed**"

"**Long term studies are still needed**"

"not sufficient to produce **observable** health effects"

"**still scientific uncertainty**"

"**unlikely** to cause cancer in humans"

"**some evidence** RF exposure can influence EEG"

"health relevance of this is **uncertain.**"

"no **consistent** evidence"

"**BUT THERE IS STILL UNCERTAINTY REGARDING LONG TERM EFFECTS**"

"but there have been **few studies**"

"however **research is underway** effects on children and adolescents"

"cannot **currently** draw definitive conclusions concerning the existence of adverse health effects"

"**wi fi uses the same frequency as cell phones**, but..."

"**overwhelmingly** not shown adverse effects.."

"**not sufficient** to draw any conclusions.."

"nor is there any **apparent** biophysical basis.."

"no adverse health effects have been **consistently** observed."

Without any commentary on the validity of any of the sources of the material you have chosen to review, I wonder if you or anyone on your panel sees a recurrent pattern here? Are you willing to gamble with the lives of our children with consistent statements of inconsistency? Despite the obvious conclusions that can be drawn from the above material extracted from your report, a scientist, perhaps any scientist, will tell you that consistency in replication of studies is nearly if not completely impossible and has little or nothing to do with the validity of a study. If you want to know the validity of a study, look at the source of funding.

It is a false premise to base your decision on. What you should base your decision on is the FACT that 75% of industry funded studies show no harm while 75% of independently funded studies (free from industry funding) show harm. I think the study below is the only study that you should be looking at:

[**UW Scientist Henry Lai Makes Waves in the Cell Phone Industry**](#)

www.seattlemag.com › [Arts & Culture](#) › [News & Features](#) › [Health](#)

A greeting card on bioengineering professor *Henry Lai's* office wall at the University ... After initially accepting *industry funding* for continued *research* from the ... For every independent *study* showing *damage* to DNA and memory, there is a ... that the available scientific evidence does *not show* that any health problems are ...

David Morrison

Personal Information - Privacy...

Vancouver WA 98661

Personal Information...

Personal Information - Privacy - RCW 42.56.2...